

Remarks

I. Change in the Correspondence Address and Attorney of Record.

Enclosed herewith, please find form PTO/SB/82 containing a revocation of power of attorney with new power of attorney and change of correspondence address.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests that the attorney docket number associated with this application change from GTDV120953 to 80100/007.

II. General Comments on the Office Action of March 8, 2007 and Newly Presented Claims.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating the presence of allowable subject matter in claims 6, 8, 11, 17, 19, and 22 and for allowing claims 24-32.

According to the Examiner, claims 1-5, 7, 9, 10, 13-16, 18, 20, and 21 are anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,189,248 to Sully (hereinafter referred to as "Sully"). For at least the reasons that follow, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-5, 7, 9, 10, 13-16, 18, 20, and 21.

By way of the foregoing amendments, Applicant has presented new claims 34-36. Applicant submits that these claim are allowable for the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend and also for at least the additional reason that Sully neither teaches nor suggests that "the separation angle is selected so that, as the gripping device is rotated relative to the actuation member, the amount of friction between the first engagement surface and the first interface surface varies."

III. Sully does not teach or suggest all the elements of claims 1-5, 7, 9, 10, 13-16, 18, 20, and 21.

Claims 1 recite "the gripping device being selectively couplable to the actuation member and rotatable about the central axis of the actuation member between a locked position ... and an unlocked position, wherein the gripping device is removable from the actuation member." Claim 13 recites "the gripping device is selectively couplable to the actuation member and is rotatable about the central axis of the actuation member between a locked position ... and an unlocked position, wherein the gripping device is removable from the actuation member." Although the Examiner contends that the "spring member 55" corresponds to a "gripping device", as discussed below, Sully teaches that the "spring member 55" can only be removed by being pulled off the operating shaft 15, which the Examiner contends is analogous to an "actuation member". Therefore, for the reasons

that follow, Applicant respectfully points out that Sully neither teaches nor suggests a gripping device rotated between a locked position and an unlocked position, whereat the gripping device is removable from the actuation member.

Turning now to Sully, this reference teaches a handle 10 connected to an operating shaft 15. Sully, Col. 3, ll. 59-60. In Sully, the 10 handle and operating shaft 15 include interfitting splines 27, 40 that prevent relative rotation between the handle 10 and operating shaft 15, when the handle 10 is secured to the operating shaft 15. Sully, Col. 2, ll. 64-67 and Col. 3, ln. 59 – Col. 4, ln. 3. In this manner, rotation of the handle 10 transmits torque to the operating shaft 15 so that the device therein may function to open a window. Sully, Col. 1, ll. 9-15 and Col. 3, ln. 59 – Col. 4, ln. 3.

The device of Sully also includes a “spring member 55”. Whereas the splines 27, 40, prevent relative rotation between the handle 10 and the operating shaft 15, the spring member 55 prevents the handle 10 from being axially displaced from the operating shaft 15. Sully, Col. 3, ln. 42 – Col. 4, ln. 7. As Sully teaches, once the hook portions 65, 66, which include legs 70, 71, which the Examiner contends correspond to “a first interference surface”, are snap fit to detent notches including detent surfaces 28, 29, which the Examiner contends correspond to “a first engagement surface”, the handle 10 is “for all practical purposes ... permanently attached to the operating shaft”. Sully, Col. 3, ll. 42-60. Sully also teaches, however, that “[i]f [it] [is] necessary to remove the handle, a strong pull thereof will enable release of the handle”. Sully, Col. 4, ll. 3-4. This is accomplished as a result of axial displacement of the hook portions 65, 66 with respect to the detent notches due to a camming action between the legs 71 and the detent surfaces 29. Sully, Col. 4, ll. 3-7. This camming action causes the hook portions 65, 66, which include the legs 70, 71 to snap inwardly so that they are no longer within the detent notches. As a result, the handle 10 and the spring member 55 may be removed from the operating shaft by axial displacement.

Accordingly, in Sully, the spring member 55 does not rotate from a locked position to an unlocked position, whereat the spring member 55 is removable from the operating shaft 15. In fact, once the spring member 55 is secured to the operating shaft 15, any relative rotation between the spring member 55 and operating shaft 15 is necessarily precluded by virtue of the interfitting splines 27, 40. Sully, Col. 3, ln. 59 – Col. 4, ln. 3.

Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 13. Furthermore, since claims 5, 7, 9, and 10 depend from claim 1 and claims 14-16, 18, 20, and 21 depend from claim 13, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 5, 7, 9, 10, 14-16, 18, 20, and 22.

Furthermore, with respect to claims 3 and 14, Applicant respectfully submits that Sully neither teaches nor suggests "the first engagement surface is inclined relative to the first interference surface by a selected separation angle". Although the Examiner contends that Sully teaches the foregoing element on Col. 2, lines 58-63, this passage merely states that the walls 28 and 29, which the Examiner contends are first engagement surfaces, are sloped and inclined to form a cam member having a cam surface. This passage does not teach any relationship between the walls 28, 29, which the Examiner contends are first engagement surfaces, and the legs 70, 71, which the Examiner contends are first interference surfaces. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Sully does not teach a "first engagement surface is inclined relative to the first interference surface" nor a "selected separation angle". Accordingly, for at least this additional reason, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 3 and 14. Furthermore, since claims 4 and 15 depend from respective claims claim 3 and 14, for at least this additional reason, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 4 and 15.

Additionally, with respect to claims 4 and 15, Applicant submits that Sully neither teaches nor suggests "the selected separation angle is between about 1 degree and about 10 degrees". Although the Examiner contends that Sully teaches the foregoing element on Col. 3, lines 16-20, this passage merely states that the legs 70, 71, which the Examiner contends are first interface surfaces, are sloped at respective angles 30° and 15°. This passage does not teach any relationship between the walls 28, 29, which the Examiner contends are first engagement surfaces, and the legs 70, 71, which the Examiner contends are first interference surfaces. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Sully does not teach a "separation angle" as defined in the claims or that it is "between about 1 degree and about 10 degrees". Accordingly, for at least this additional reason, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 4 and 15.

IV. Conclusion

Applicant submits that the subject matter of the present application is novel, nonobvious, and useful. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections and objections be withdrawn and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Dated: April 11, 2007



SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Michael Pruden, Reg. No. 52,135

Ollila Law Group, L.L.C.

Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 22

Facsimile: (303) 938-9995